

**REMARKS**

In the Non-Final Office Action dated August 4, 2008, the Examiner: (a) rejects Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritsch et al. (5,829,987) in view of Adshead et al. (4,676,562) and (b) rejects Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritsch et al. in view of Adshead et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Harbauer (4,318,065). By this response, Applicant has amended Claims 1-3, 5, 9 and 10.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritsch et al. (5,829,987) in view of Adshead et al. (4,676,562). Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-3, 5 and 9 have been amended to distinguish applicant's invention more clearly over the cited prior art. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of a battery. Neither Fritsch nor Adshead teach or suggest utilizing magnets in a connection terminal and a connection piece for connecting an electrical line and a battery. Claim 1 has also been amended to further define the invention to include a permanent magnet being disposed in one of the connection terminal and the connection piece, and an electromagnetic disposed in the other of the connection terminal and the connection piece. Fritsch teaches the use of permanent magnets being disposed in both the connection terminal and the connection piece. Fritsch fails to disclose, teach or suggest the use of a permanent magnet disposed in one of the connection terminal or the connection piece and being associated with the electromagnetic disposed in the other of the connection terminal and connection piece to repel or attract the connection terminal and the connection piece. Adshead only teaches an electrical connector for making a temporary electrical connection between a cable and an electrically conductive ferromagnetic surface.

While Adshead states that an electromagnet may be used to reinforce a permanent magnet, it fails to disclose how. Adshead is silent to placement of the electromagnet in relation to the permanent magnet. As such, Adshead fails to disclose, teach or suggest the use of a permanent disposed in one of the connection terminal or connection piece and being associated with a electromagnetic disposed in the other of the connection terminal and connection piece to repel or attract the connection terminal and the connection piece. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to be consistent with Claim 1, Claim 5 has been amended to read more clearly, and Claim 9 has been amended for proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2 - 9 depend ultimately, on Claim 1 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. The dependent claims distinguish over their parent and one another by reciting applicant's invention in greater detail. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are overcome.

The Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritsch et al. in view of Adshead et al. as applied to Claims 1 above, and further in view of Harbauer (4,318,065). Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 10 has been amended to correct Claim 10 for proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 10 depends ultimately, on Claim 1 and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. The dependent claims distinguish over their parent and one another by reciting applicant's invention in greater detail. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are overcome.

Claim 13 has been added. Claim 13 is supported by the specification and no new matter has been added. Claim 13 recites an electrical line having a connection piece with an electromagnet. Due to a supply of current, the electromagnet counteracts the magnetic force of a permanent magnet on a connection terminal of a battery, such that it is possible for the connection piece to attract or repel the connection terminal. Claim 13 is distinguished over the prior art references cited by the Examiner. The prior art references fail to disclose, teach or suggest an electromagnet that counteracts the magnetic force of a permanent magnet owing to a supply of current. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that Claim 13 distinguishes applicant's invention over the cited prior art and should be allowed.

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant has responded in a fully satisfactory manner to all matters at issue in this Application, and that this Application is now in condition for allowance. In this regard, Applicant has made every effort to comply with the requirements set forth in the Non-Final Office Action as well as the statutory requirements. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow the pending claims and pass the Application to issue. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 433-7200.

The Patent Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to Deposit Account No. 04-1061 in the name of Dickinson Wright PLLC.

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/597,833  
Attorney Docket: 27181-0063  
Reply to Office Action of September 9, 2008

Prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dickinson Wright PLLC  
Attorneys for Applicant

Date: December 9, 2008

By:

  
Craig A. Phillips  
Reg. No. 47,858

Dickinson Wright, PLLC.  
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200  
Washington 20006  
(248) 433-7285  
BLOOMFIELD 27181-63 953803v1